

Illinois U Library 75th BROADCAST Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 310 Stations of the ABC Radio Network

S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Recognition of Communist China: British-American Attitudes

Moderators:

JAMES MURRAY, JR. and JOHN MacVANE

Speakers

EDWIN LEATHER

RALPH FLANDERS



COMING

—July 28, 1953—

What Is Happening Behind the
Iron Curtain?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 19, NUMBER 12



\$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOLUME 19

No. 12



Recognition of Communist China: British-American Attitudes

The Broadcast of July 21, 1953, from 9:00 to 9:45 P.M., E.S.T., came to you from ABC in New York and the BBC Radio Network in London through facilities of transatlantic communication.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recording made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

SEN. RALPH E. FLANDERS—Republican of Vermont. Born in Vermont in 1880, Senator Flanders attended school in Rhode Island but was unable to enter college because his earnings were needed at home. From a job as apprentice to learn the machinist trade he worked up to the presidency of Jones and Lamson Machine Company in 1933.

The appointment which Senator Flanders considers his most important one also came in 1933 when Secretary of Commerce Roper named him to the new Business Advisory and Planning Council. He became an outspoken opponent of New Deal policies through the council.

In 1944, after serving with the War Production Board, he accepted a position as president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Two years later he was named temporary president of the American Research and Development Corporation, formed to provide capital for new products and enterprise.

That same year, Ralph Flanders was asked by Governor Proctor to fill the unexpired term of Senator Warren Austin. He was elected at the 1946 general election, and again last year. In the 83rd Congress, Senator Flanders is a member of the Armed Services and Finance Committees, and is Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report.

THE HON. EDWIN H. C. LEATHER—Member of Parliament. A member of the Conservative Party, Mr. Leather was born in Toronto, Canada in 1919. He was educated at Trinity College, Canada, then left a promising business future in his own country to go to England where he felt he could do more than at home to promote the cause of Atlantic Union. Deciding to enter British politics, he won his first seat in Parliament in 1945 in a tough Socialist constituency, and his present one in a three cornered race in a district which has changed its M. P. in almost every election.

Along with Atlantic Union and general foreign relations, Mr. Leather's keenest legislative interest has been in the field of labor. He is now Honorary Secretary of the Conservative Party's Parliamentary labor committee, and was the first active Conservative trade unionist member of Parliament.

Moderators: From London—**JAMES F. MURRAY, JR.**—Attorney, international counsel and lecturer.

From New York—**JOHN MacVANE**—ABC news commentator.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to The Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Recognition of Communist China: British-American Attitudes

Announcer:

Town Meeting tonight comes to you from New York and London, spanning the Atlantic to bring you a discussion of one of the most important issues of our time. In more than eighteen years on the air, Town Meeting has presented free and open discussions from all sections of the United States and from many countries throughout the world. In many of these instances we have gone directly to the source of the news to bring our listeners the most authoritative comment and interpretation available.

Tonight, through facilities of transatlantic communication, we present the views of a United States Senator, and a member of Parliament of Great Britain, talking over an issue of vital concern to their respective nations. Neither speaks officially for his government, but both join in a frank discussion so that you may understand better their different points of view. In the spirit of Town Hall's objectives as a clearing house for ideas, we invite you to weigh these opinions and to decide for yourself which is the course to follow.

Now to preside as moderator for tonight's discussion, here is ABC's news commentator, John MacVane — Mr. MacVane.

Moderator MacVane:

The subject of our discussion is: "Recognition of Communist China." I think, however, that we will find that when we get talking, the topic will carry us into related fields. From diplomatic recognition naturally arises the question of trade with Communist China. That was in the

news this past week end because of a Senate subcommittee report highly critical of Britain's trade with Peiping. Also, if you recognize a government diplomatically and trade with it, what about approving this government as representing China in the United Nations? Undoubtedly, we will investigate all these matters tonight.

Standing by in London to present Great Britain's attitude is Mr. Edwin H. C. Leather, Conservative member of Parliament. With him as moderator is James F. Murray, Jr., attorney and international counsel. Also in London are several citizens who will participate in our question period.

Along with other citizen questioners in New York, we have Senator Ralph E. Flanders, Republican of Vermont, who will state the American position. The Senator took part in the unanimous Senate vote opposing U. S. recognition of the Chinese Communist Government.

Now let's go first to London and James F. Murray, Jr.

Mr. Murray:

Thank you, John, and good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We are speaking to you from the Aeolian Hall studios of the B. B. C., not far from Hyde Park, London's historic open air forum in the heart of the West End. In contrast to the recent sweltering temperatures in New York, it is in the mild 70's here.

Along the River Thames, preparations are underway for tomorrow's gala river pageant to be reviewed by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, as the concluding official ceremony in the spectacular series

of coronation events which began last June.

British headlines tonight continue the threat of the Korean War and the problem of the United Nations with North Korea and Red China. The predominant British attitude both in Conservative and Labor party circles differs in ways from our own. This is particularly true with respect to the question of extending recognition to Communist China.

We have tonight to present that British viewpoint, the Honorable Edwin H. C. Leather, Conservative member of Parliament from North Somerset. Mr. Leather, by the way, is Canadian-born, has served in Parliament since 1945, and has played a leading role in policy development in international and American affairs. Mr. Leather, why do you favor the recognition of the Communist Chinese Government?

Mr. Leather:

Well, the word *favor* wasn't very happily chosen, because if you put it like that, I wouldn't favor it. But our understanding of recognition is simply this—that you recognize a fact. It may be a pleasant fact, or it may be an unpleasant fact.

In this case, it is very unpleasant, but because it is unpleasant we don't try to pretend that it doesn't exist.

Recognition of a foreign government does not and never has implied the slightest sympathy or support of that government in any way. For example, we don't presume that you Americans and my friend, Senator Flanders, and his colleagues in Washington are particularly sympathetic to the government in the Kremlin, but you recognize it. You always have recognized it, and as far as I know

there has been no question of withdrawing recognition from it. Now the Kremlin Government surely is just as Communist as the Peiping Government, and frankly we think it illogical to recognize the one and not the other.

But you will say, "Well, that's all very well; we do disapprove of the Moscow Government, but, of course, the answer is that we are at war with the Peiping Government and therefore, it is quite another question." And it is, of course. Quite true. I must remind you that we were at war with Hitler's government, but you never withdrew recognition from it and neither did any of the rest of the allies. We had no truck or trade or dealings with it, but we still recognized it.

There was also, of course, a not uncomparable case to the present one in the question of Vichy France. After the fall of France, Hitler's puppet government in Vichy was recognized by the United States, and you went on recognizing it. In fact, you even exchanged ambassadors and full diplomatic staff with them right through the war. But we didn't, as a result of that, accuse you of being false to the allied cause, and I think you would have resented it if we had. But we believe that the two situations are absolutely comparable. We are doing no more than recognizing the unpleasant fact that Mao Tze-tung's forces are in control of the mainland of China.

I would like to add this. It so happens that both Senator Flanders and I are signators of the Atlantic Union Resolutions in our respective parliaments—the House of Commons over here and the Senate over there. I am quite certain of one thing, John, and that is that

the unity and co-ordinated action of our two peoples are infinitely more important than any possible differences we might have on this or any other issue. And it is important in that context to remember that nearly all these differences of opinion are what I might call unofficial.

They are written about in the papers and talked about by people, but in no case do they represent the views of our two governments. There hasn't yet been any case, at all, in our attitudes or policies or actions in the Far East, with the sole exception of recognition, that our two governments have not been able to quickly reconcile their differences, as was confirmed again only this last week in the statements by the Secretary of State and our Foreign Secretary in Washington who reconfirmed their common attitude.

The argument, I think, has largely been between your extreme right in the United States and our extreme left over here in Britain, but it hasn't been an argument between our two governments; with this one exception, on which, I repeat, we believe we are doing nothing more than recognizing the unpleasant fact. We certainly don't feel that we want to have any kind of position of holding a balance or third force or anything of that kind.

The policy of the present government, and I believe certainly the official policy of our opposition, is that the unity and concord of our two peoples is a primary factor in foreign affairs. We'd rather even both say the same thing than be right. I think it is as important as that.

Mr. Murray: Thank you, Mr. Leather, and now we will return you to Town Hall in New York.

Mr. MacVane:

Well, thanks, Mr. Murray and Mr. Leather. Now, let us hear the United States viewpoint as expressed by one of the most able members of the Senate—Ralph E. Flanders, Vermont Republican, who is a member of the Senate Armed Services and Finance Committees. Senator Flanders.

Senator Flanders:

Good evening, Mr. Leather. It is a great privilege for an American to be permitted to discuss, with a representative of the British Parliament, the question of whether or not Communist China should be recognized. It is important, indeed, that certain fundamentals in American opinion be set forth before we get down to details. Without being fully aware of the general state of British opinion, I think it is safe to say that over here we are much more concerned about the evils and dangers of communism than may be the case elsewhere. We regard it as an evil, and a very dangerous evil. We feel that we must be on our guard against it night and day, year in and out.

Viewing the cancerous extension of this evil through the body politic of one nation after another, bringing slavery and suffering to one people after another, we cannot view this situation as a mere current incident in world politics. We cannot view the growth in power of communism as anything else than the climax of a turning point in history. Any attempt to understand American opinion and American policy in any other light than this will fail to disclose the true situation.

We acknowledge the established diplomatic precedent that the recognition of a government does not necessarily imply that we are fa-

vorably disposed toward the principles and acts of the government recognized. The recognition of communist China, however, we feel to be beyond precedent. We are at war with evil ideas. We are devoted to their restraint and ultimate destruction. To recognize a major proponent of these ideas begins a train of events which we must not permit to get started.

To begin with, we would be recognizing a government which *refuses* to be recognized. It has a well-displayed contempt for the family of nations. I might remark parenthetically, Mr. Leather, that contempt has been displayed in connection with your own nation's recognition of that government. Suppose that in spite of the evil purpose of a Communist Government, and in spite of its contempt for international co-operation, our government is so foolish as to recognize Communist China. What will happen? The first event in logical sequence will mean that we would support, or at least could not object to, the membership of that government in the United Nations.

The second step would be that the Communist Government would replace the present Nationalist Government as representatives of the Chinese people as permanent members of the Security Council. It would be difficult to avoid taking this second step.

A third step would be a Security Council with two outright communist members on the one side, the United States, and a nation which has not yet been able to form a strong anti-communist government on the other, with your own country, great Britain, holding the balance of power.

I hope, Mr. Leather, you will pardon my frankness when I say that the differences in viewpoint

which I emphasized in the beginning make this a very dubious undertaking. I continue my frankness when I say that the foresight of Great Britain as to the results of Japan's invasion of Manchuria, and Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia, and of Hitler's successive seizures of power in Germany do not give us the needed confidence that the long-range view of your statesmen will be available for wise action as the balance of power in the Council of the United Nations.

We have a boundless admiration for the British people. We do not feel that they have always been well served by those who have directed the foreign policy of their government. In expressing this doubt, I do not wish to infer that American public opinion and American policy have been one hundred per cent right and one hundred per cent effective. I do wish to infer, or rather to state, that American public opinion in all those cases was very much disturbed.

Now, Mr. Leather, this is an open and honest discussion of the problem which faces our two nations. I am sure it is wiser to approach this matter in this manner than it is to indulge in genteel generalities.

Mr. MacVane: Well, thank you, Senator Flanders. It is our custom to ask each of our guests what he wants to say about the other's statement, and I am sure Mr. Leather wants to comment immediately. So we take you now to London.

Mr. Murray: Mr. Leather has been making notes here, John, and I turn the microphone over to him.

Mr. Leather: Well, thank you very much, Senator. I can assure you that there is no fundamental

difference between us at all, and the only one real point in your remarks that I would disagree with, and we do disagree profoundly, is that there is any lack of awareness in this country of the evils and dangers of communism. Believe me, that is not correct.

Don't forget, after all, we have not only been fighting communism with blood and bullets since 1950; we have been fighting the communists, and the Chinese Communist-supplied army in Malaya ever since 1946, and we have been doing it entirely by ourselves for quite a long time, and we have been having very, very heavy casualties for quite a long time. We are very well aware of it, but, believe me, I think the only point where we differ is when we come to the question of what we are going to do about it. And we believe, as I say, that facing the unpleasant facts is just part of the realities of politics.

You mentioned also the problem of the United Nations membership. Now, I clearly realize, as I am sure my leaders do, that that is a thorny and tough nut that some day we will have to crack, but we don't know when we are going to have to crack it; we don't know under what circumstances we are going to have to crack it, and, therefore, we are not prepared to lay down any firm line of policy or principles to be followed now.

That we support you entirely, Mr. Eden reiterated in the House only a few weeks ago. Again Mr. Eden reiterated that we would never recommend that China come into the United Nations as long as she is at war with the United Nations. We are not sure that we will recommend it afterwards; we regard that as an open question to be settled as and when the time comes.

Mr. Flanders: Mr. Leather, your argument is very appealing and really very effective. However, we must state, and I think I am right in stating, that over here we are dubiously looking back at our past history so far as recognition of the Soviet Government is concerned. I wouldn't feel that I was wrong in saying that we don't know whether any further recognition should be given to any country which conceals itself behind an iron curtain, or a bamboo curtain, or any other curtain.

The very fact that it does so proclaims to the world that that government is unprepared to take on the responsibilities of membership in the family of nations, that it will not be a member in any true sense of the word. It reads itself outside of the pale of international co-operation.

Mr. MacVane: Would you like to say anything about that, Mr. Leather?

Mr. Leather: Well, sure, that is perfectly fair, but, of course, I am sure you would agree, Senator, we are now adumbrating a new policy, a new attitude toward the question of recognition altogether. China may be the first state to come under the new policy and it may come to that, but I would like to suggest that while I quite agree with you when you say that a country that sets up a government such as Peiping has done sets itself apart and spurns the family of nations. Of course, I don't dispute that at all.

Again I say the important question for us as politicians is, "What are we going to do about it?" To adopt a similarly exclusive policy and draw into one's shell may by no means be the right thing to do. I think Mr. Dulles made the statement not long ago on the

question of trading with the satellite countries that the very fact that we have contact and at least can talk to somebody there is at least better than no contact at all. I am not optimistic, but it is at least better than nothing.

Mr. Flanders: Well, I would suggest that when we say that we would be withdrawing into our shell, it is not we who withdraw into our shell, it is the nations who conceal themselves behind the curtain, and we have plenty of experience of diplomatic contacts with countries which have done so. Our experience with Soviet Russia, our experience in the two-year-long negotiations in Korea, leads us to doubt, and I think leads us wisely to doubt, the advantages of being able to talk face to face with people who do not wish to co-operate and who announce by their actions that they are completely unco-operative. There is a new situation.

Mr. Leather: There again I don't disagree with that at all. But you know, isn't it rather like two people who have had a row and one of them says, "I won't speak to you?" If both of them would take that attitude, quite obviously nobody would ever get anywhere. We may never get anywhere in the end, anyway. But at least if one party is prepared to constantly, patiently, doggedly go on showing its good faith, and showing that it is being reasonable, I think that that is better than a purely negative attitude of saying that, "If you are going to be bad boys, we are going to be bad boys, too." I'd put it no higher than that.

Senator Flanders: Why not, on the other hand, take the point of view that if any nation will come

from behind the Iron Curtain, and join the family of nations, that we are then on a footing which might lead to the fact of diplomatic representation and much else besides.

Mr. Leather: I agree with that. Absolutely. The hand of friendship is always open, if the other party prepares to take it.

Senator Flanders: The other party is not prepared to take that as yet, and neither is any Communist country whatsoever.

Mr. Leather: Well, that, I agree, Senator, of course. That's unarguable. But again, I do think —take it from the attitude of the Communist people. There's good ground to believe that both the BBC service and the Voice of America do a great deal of good. It does get to an awful lot of people behind the curtain, the hand of friendship. And by so doing, it undoes a certain amount of the Communist government's own propaganda. Now if we stop doing those things; if we show the people as well as the leaders in Communist countries that we won't be friendly with them and we won't have anything to do with them, it seems to me that we would rather be cutting off our noses to spite our faces, and I don't think we'd do any good. It might relieve our righteous indignation, but I don't think it would help.

Senator Flanders: Here, we are not disagreeing. If your point of view includes making a sharp distinction, for instance, between the Soviet government and the people of Russia, or between the puppet governments and the people of the satellites, or between a Communist government of China and the people of China. I am strong for that and so is our country, although

we haven't sufficiently implemented making contacts with peoples the basis of our diplomacy, when we find that the governments are not willing to join the society of nations, and are not willing to be on a workable diplomatic basis.

Mr. MacVane: Of course there is one point that neither of you gentlemen has brought up yet, the fact that our governments recognize two separate and distinct Chinese governments, one the government on Formosa of Chiang Kai-shek, and the other the Communist government in Peiping.

Senator Flanders: I was afraid somebody would bring that up. (*Laughter*)

Mr. Leather: Well, you see, my feeling about that is that with the greatest respect for General Chiang Kai-shek, he does not control China. It's quite sensible to call him the government of Formosa, if you like, but he is no more the government of China than he is the government of India. He doesn't control it. It's very unfortunate, but it happens to be true.

Senator Flanders: We can't well recognize a vacuum; we will continue recognizing Chiang Kai-shek as the representative of the Chinese people so far as there is one. The government of China we do not recognize is a government which the people of China necessarily recognize.

Mr. Leather: Well, that's fair enough, but you could only prove that one by carrying out a Gallup poll in China. (*Laughter*.) I don't know how far you'd get.

Senator Flanders: I told you I was afraid someone would bring that one up.

Mr. MacVane: Here in New

York, as well as in London, we have a number of citizens who are anxious to question our speakers. Mr. Murray, may we have our first question over there?

Mr. Murray: Yes, John MacVane. We have a question directed to Senator Flanders, I believe from this gentleman on our right.

Questioner: I'm a business man. Senator Flanders, is there any consistency in the United States recognition of the Russian Communist regime and the United States refusal to give similar recognition to the Peiping government?

Senator Flanders: To which government?

Mr. MacVane: To the Peiping government — the Chinese Communist government, he said. Is there any inconsistency in our recognizing one and not the other?

Senator Flanders: The Russian Communist government was recognized a great many years ago in the face of much doubt and against a strong degree of public opinion, especially that which was headed by ex-President Hoover. It has not been a particularly happy thing and I'm not sure we would want to use it as a precedent.

Mr. MacVane: There's a question on this side, a question for Mr. Leather.

Questioner: I'm a public school teacher and I should like to ask this question of Mr. Leather. Have the British gained anything in trade or security by their recognition of the Chinese Communist government?

Mr. Leather: No, nothing whatever, and didn't expect to gain anything by it, but you see, it comes back to the point I made earlier that we regard the recognition as being nothing more than exactly what it says. We rec-

ognize the fact that the Communists are in control of China. We don't expect to gain anything by it; far from it, it's one of our biggest headaches, but we don't pretend that it doesn't exist.

Mr. MacVane: I might remind both of our guests that they can comment on questions that the other answers. If Senator Flanders wants to comment on Mr. Leather's answer, or Mr. Leather wants to comment on Senator Flander's answer to any question, please be quite free to break right in and go ahead.

Mr. Murray: Mr. Leather is nodding his head in approval. I think he's waiting for the opportunity.

Mr. Leather: The Senator and I are having a very tough time trying to disagree at all, I think.

Mr. MacVane: Is there another question?

Mr. Murray: Yes, we have a question here.

Questioner: I'm a pharmaceutical chemist. I would like to ask Senator Flanders, should the majority of nations in the United Nations organization decide to seat Peiping, would the United States be prepared to use its veto to block such a move?

Senator Flanders: As I get the question, if Communist China should seek admission to the United Nations, should we block it by a veto? I would feel that we must block by a veto any attempt to admit any other nations to the United Nations which hide behind the curtain, because we admit living lies so far as concerns any real honesty in seeking that admission.

Mr. MacVane: There is an international legal point there, I might point out, that this is not exactly

admitting the Chinese Communist government. It's simply recognizing the Chinese Communist government as representative of a member nation, a nation which is already a member, China, so there is a legal point. The veto might not work.

Senator Flanders: The question is whether it's procedural or whether it's substantive, so that there is a legal point here.

Mr. Leather: May I just put in too, Senator, that there is this difficulty which I think the questioner raised. Supposing that the Korean War comes to an end, as we hope it will, and in six months or a year's time, everything in the garden is comparatively lovely, and a majority of the other members of the United Nations vote largely in favor of admitting Communist China. Then I, certainly, as one of the United States' greatest friends in a foreign country, would feel very dubious about you putting yourselves securely and soundly across the will of the majority of the rest of the world and saying — because the rest of the world doesn't agree with us, we are going to veto it. Surely that is one of the things that we object to most in what Communists do.

Senator Flanders: Well, the question is in our minds over here one of principle. We do feel, as I said in the beginning, that the communist menace represents a major climax in the history of mankind, and viewing it from that standpoint, we are not going to allow the Communist influence to increase in the United Nations if we can help it. That's a flat statement.

Mr. MacVane: Now we continue with a question from this

side of the Atlantic. Will you go ahead, sir?

Questioner: I work as an editor for a publishing company. I have a question for Mr. Leather. Do the Labor government and Churchill government differ in their policy toward Communist China?

Mr. Leather: No, I think I can answer that quite clearly, definitely no. The Labor government was second only to your own government in supporting the United Nations when they declared war against the North Koreans when all this show started. While I might in a party mood think we've done things a little better than they have done, I wouldn't like to say that on this program. Certainly our views are the same. But if I could just take a point out of that too, apropos of the Senator's last remark. Believe me, once again, we agree one hundred percent on the evils of communism and on the necessity to combat it. We are purely at difference on the best way to go about it, and making the line that we'll never recognize them under any conditions or never let them in the United Nations under any conditions—again I would only say we would feel that it is probably making a situation already bad much worse instead of holding out the prospect that at least it might get better.

Mr. Murray: We have another question for Mr. Leather.

Questioner: I wanted to ask Mr. Leather if what he has said applies to British public opinion?

Mr. Leather: Yes, I would certainly say it does. I believe that public opinion here, as has been over time and time again, is

solidly behind the government in what it is doing, and the simple proof of that would be that on, I think, every occasion both under the Labor Government and under the present Government, when statements of policy have been made in the House of Commons on the war in Korea, there's never yet been an opposition divide against them on any single occasion. I think that's pretty good proof of the unanimity of the people of this country behind the anti-Communist effort.

Senator Flanders: Mr. Leather, if I understood you, you were suggesting that our position was, or at least as I stated it, that never under any circumstances would we recognize the present government of the mainland in China. That is not true, so far as my own personal point of view is concerned. If they would come out from under the Curtain and become candidates for membership in the family of nations, I would change my opinion immediately. I doubt, however, whether if they did that they could possibly still remain Communists.

Mr. Leather: I agree with you, Senator. The only question then is what's more likely to get them out from their shell.

Senator Flanders: Well, perhaps that's where we differ. I have severe doubts about any display of camaraderie accomplishing the thing that we both want.

Mr. MacVane: Is there another question?

Mr. Murray: Yes.

Questioner: What do you believe would be the effect of recognition of Communist China on the United States strategic position in the Pacific?

Senator Flanders: Do you mean

the strategic position militarily speaking, or diplomatically speaking?

Questioner: Firstly, diplomatically.

Senator Flanders: Well, militarily speaking, I do not see that it would improve our situation at all. Diplomatically speaking, I think it would weaken us very much for reasons which I have been trying to describe all this evening.

Mr. MacVane: I think we have a question from this side—a lady, addressed to Mr. Leather.

Questioner: I am an attorney and a member of the Board of Higher Education. Is the British policy based in part on a presumption that Mao is a potential Tito? If so, what basis is there for that belief?

Mr. Leather: Based in part—it's awfully difficult for me to give you a straight answer—no, it isn't. It isn't based on the idea that he's a Tito, but quite clearly Communist China isn't a satellite. It's a Junior Partner, if you like, but it has a quite different position in status in the Communist world than Tito had in Yugoslavia or than any of the other satellites. It's always gone its own way, and in fact some of you may have seen—some papers came out of Russia only this week, which indicate that the Russians may have been very annoyed at Communist China going into Korea at all because they wanted to preserve their own influence there. Now, I don't know whether that's so or not, but it's a very plausible line of thought, and quite clearly, Mao has never been prepared to bow down before Moscow in the way that the satellites have. Therefore, while we don't think that we can treat him as a Tito—I

mean, we're quite clear we can't—we do believe that he's a new phenomenon in the Communist world, and therefore he's got to be treated very gingerly, and we hope in the end will be able to be treated differently. I wouldn't put it any stronger than that.

Mr. MacVane: I notice that thus far we haven't mentioned Britain's trade with China. That's become quite a warm subject over here in the past few days because of the Senatorial Subcommittee's report which said that Britain had recently increased her trade with Communist China, and the report was highly critical of Britain. Could you say anything at all, Sir, about—

Mr. Leather: I certainly could. I'd be very delighted to. I've been mild and sweet up to now, but I confess you've got me on a sore point, because we're pretty made about what's being said in the United States about this. You see, in the first place, it's completely wrong, utterly wrong, as your own government has said time and time again, to suggest that there's any trade in strategic and war-like goods going into Communist China at all. There's absolutely none. In the second place, we have been doing since 1950 and are doing today a great deal less trade with Communist China than Japan is, and Japan up till only a short time ago was entirely under the control of your government. At the time, a year or more ago, when we were being violently accused for trading with the Chinese, the Japs were trading with them and licenses in those days had to be passed by Senator McCarthy's own staff officers. So we think it's a little funny to accuse us. And also we would point out, if you're going to refer to Hong Kong, that we think it

most peculiar for some of our friends in the States—or possibly those who aren't our friends in the States—to accuse us bitterly because there's trade being done from Hong Kong with the Communists while at the same time in Berlin, which is exactly similar, on the other hand, the American government is financing trade with the Communists. We see very little difference in the two cases.

Senator Flanders: I suggest, Mr. Leather, that there is a little difference in the two cases. In the one case, in the case of China, we are dealing with an active enemy. And not all the governments associated with us in Korea are acting as if the Chinese government were an enemy. We are acting as if the Chinese government were an enemy; we think that you should. We think that all our associates in the United Nations should act as though Communist China were an enemy. So there's a difference there, as between that and any dealing with an active enemy, let me say, not just an enemy in ideas, which is bad enough, but it's an enemy who is killing your sons and our sons. Now that does not seem yet to have become completely understood in the actual actions of the various governments who are concerned with Chinese trade.

Mr. MacVane: Could you say anything on that American attitude, Mr. Leather?

Mr. Leather: I can't speak for any other government, but I can assure you that it's perfectly clear with our government and in this country. And if you say it's a good idea to cut off all trade—I repeat, all—from Hong Kong to China, then you're saying that you want Hong Kong handed over to the Communists, because that

would be the inevitable result, and in our view it would do the Allied cause infinitely more harm than good.

Senator Flanders: Mr. Leather, we're trying to agree insofar as we can, and let us both agree on this—that this particular thorny question will not be decided by guesses; it will not be decided by accusation, but that it will have to be decided by real documentary evidence.

Mr. MacVane: Well, our time is nearing an end, and we'd like to have a closing word from Mr. Leather in London. Would you go ahead, Sir?

Mr. Murray: Mr. Leather, in about thirty seconds would you sum up your position?

Mr. Leather: Well, I can sum it up in thirty seconds very easily. I'm grateful to you, Senator, for this opportunity to discuss these differences, and I do hope that the one thing that's come out of our discussion is the fundamental unity of our two governments and of our two people. And please don't go on thinking that we aren't well aware of the dangers of Communism and that we haven't been fighting it for a long time. The mainstay of British policy is Anglo-American unity—and I repeat that in my view and certainly in the view of Sir Winston Churchill and Mr. Eden the unity of our two governments is even more important than being right—it's fundamental to our whole way of thinking.

Mr. Murray: Thank you very much, Mr. Leather. That was Mr. Ted Leather, Conservative member of the British House of Commons. It was a pleasure to have him participate.

Mr. MacVane: And now, a final word from Senator Flanders.

Senator Flanders: Well, Mr. Leather, I have enjoyed this. I think that the measure of our agreement is very great indeed, and we must find ways of getting the measure of our agreement in ideas into agreement in practices, so that we do not differ. I might just say one thing. I am sure that the diplomacy of the future is go-

ing to direct itself to the well-being of peoples, rather than the power of governments.

Mr. MacVane: Thank you, Senator Flanders and Mr. Leather and our questioners in New York and London. Our appreciation also to Mr. Yale Newman, ABC's London correspondent, for his assistance in helping to arrange this program.



FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

STABILITY OF THE COMMUNIST CHINESE REGIME

1. Is Mao's control over the Chinese mainland complete?
 - a. Is there any force in the world both capable and willing to dislodge the Chinese Communist regime?
 - b. If yes, what is that force—Chiang's troops, the United States, etc.
2. If Communist control of the mainland is complete, what objective can be served by not recognizing what seems to be an irrevocable situation?

UNITED STATES RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

1. Is the United States morally or politically committed to the overthrow of the Chinese Communist regime? To the restoration of the Chiang government on the Chinese mainland?
2. Will the United States refuse recognition to Communist China under any circumstances?
3. If not, what are the conditions necessary for its recognition?
 - a. A Korean armistice.
 - b. A political settlement in Korea.
 - c. A general settlement of all outstanding differences in the Far East—including Indo-China, Malaya, Mainland-Formosa relationship, etc.
4. Does recognition imply approval, as President Eisenhower recently intimated?
5. Are diplomatic ties important even where disapproval exists? Would U.S. intelligence regarding activities within Communist China be improved through diplomatic representation?

TRADE WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

1. Should the U.S. continue its operation to trade with Communist China after the Korean War is terminated?
2. How extensive has Britain's trade with Communist China been? Has it been to the detriment of the U.N. cause in Korea?
3. Can the U.S. afford to ignore the importance of the Chinese trade to the economies of its allies—especially Great Britain and Japan?

U.N. RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

1. Will pressure for seating Communist China increase greatly after the Korean armistice?
2. In view of the recent Congressional resolution opposing the replacement of Chinese Nationalists by Communist China in the U.N., can the U.S. be expected to veto such a proposal?
3. Is the question of U.N. recognition of Mao's regime likely to split the Western powers?

THE MOSCOW-PEIPING AXIS

1. How strong is the Moscow-Peiping Axis? What does China's echoing of the charges against Beria indicate about the present state of Russian-Chinese relations?
2. What are the chances of driving a wedge between China and Russia? Is it to our advantage to try and do so?
3. Is Communist China more or less dangerous to the West within the Soviet orbit?

THE ASIAN OUTLOOK

1. How do the Asian people regard Communist China?
 - a. Do they regard it as a threat to their freedom and liberty?
 - b. Or do they look to China as an independent Asian nation, free of Western ties?
2. Where is the allegiance of the vast number of overseas Chinese—Formosa or the Chinese mainland?





Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 18

22. Is Today's Prosperity Real?
23. What Are the Real Differences Between the Candidates?
24. Eisenhower Or Stevenson?
25. What May We Expect from Our New President?
26. Should the Communist Party Be Outlawed?
27. What Is the Answer in Korea?
28. For Better Government: Mayor or City Manager?
29. Have We Weakened the True Meaning of Christmas?
30. What Are the Answers from Korea?
31. Has Creativeness in American Literature Declined?
32. Does Television Enrich American Home Life?
33. What Does Freedom of Speech Mean Today?
34. How Should We Fight Russia's "Hate America" Campaign?
35. Do We Overemphasize the Value of Competition in America?
36. Should Congress Liberalize Our Foreign Trade Policy?
37. Can We Hold the Western Powers Together?

38. Which Way for a Better America?
39. How Can We Convince the World of Our Belief in Brotherhood?
40. Is the United Nations the World's Best Hope for Peace?
41. How Can We Strengthen the Canadian-U. S. Partnership?
42. Who Should Judge the Fitness of Our College Teachers?
43. Should Tidelands Oil Be Returned to the States?
44. Is World Government a Realistic Goal?
45. U. S. Editors Report on Europe and the Middle East.
46. What Would a Korean Peace Mean?
47. What Should We Do With the American Communist?
48. Are Our Immigration Laws Too Restrictive?

VOLUME 19

1. Can We Afford a "Trade, Not Aid" Policy?
2. Are We Losing Our Moral Courage?
3. World Leadership and the Merchant Marine.

Order single copies at 15c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.
Town Hall, New York 36, N. Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:.....

26 Weeks for Only
\$3.00
Single Copies 15c